

Fort Peck Tribes, Montana

**Instructions for using the attached Crosswalk Reference Document
for Review and Submission of Local Mitigation Plans
to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer and FEMA Regional Office**

Attached is a crosswalk reference document, which is based on the Final Draft Report ***State and Local Plan Interim Criteria Under the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000***, published by FEMA HQ and dated July 11, 2002. This document was based on the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), enacted October 30, 2000 and *44 CFR Parts 201 and 206 Interim Final Rule*, published February 26, 2002.

The purpose of the crosswalk is to provide a tool to local jurisdictions in developing and submitting Mitigation Plans under Section 322 of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. The crosswalk can be used to assist local or multi-jurisdiction entities in the process of developing and reviewing Local or Multi-jurisdictional plan(s). Each Local or Multi-jurisdictional plan should be reviewed by the pertinent local jurisdictional entity prior to submitting the plan to the respective State. In addition as stated in the Interim Final Rule §201.6(d)(1) "Plans must be submitted to the State Hazard Mitigation Officer for initial review and coordination. The State will then send the plan to the appropriate FEMA Regional Office for formal review and approval." The local jurisdiction must fill out column 3 prior to submitting the plan for formal review and approval.

Tribes may submit hazard mitigation plans through their respective states or they can directly submit their plans to FEMA Region VIII. This means they can write a Local or Multi-jurisdictional Plan as a sub-grantee or they may write a Standard or Enhanced State Plan as a Grantee. When tribes are considering how they want to develop and submit their plans, they need to consider whether or not they want to be Grantees directly from FEMA or Sub-grantees through their respective states. The deciding factor would be how they want to apply for and receive Pre-disaster Mitigation Grant projects, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program projects, or Flood Mitigation Assistance projects. Interested tribes can determine this by talking with their State Hazard Mitigation Officer or their respective FEMA Regional Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration (FIMA) Division. In any case, each tribe should review their own plans before submitting them to their state or FEMA Regional office.

Following are explanations of each column.

- Column 1 indicates on what page or pages in the *State and Local Plan Interim Criteria* document more detailed information can be found regarding the requirements.
- Column 2 references and directly quotes the *44 CFR Parts 201 and 206 Interim Final Rule*.
- Column 3 is for the tribe and/or local jurisdiction to indicate the Section or Annex and the page number(s) in their plan where the requirement is addressed.
- Column 4 provides space for State/FEMA comments and for scoring of the plan.

Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

Local Requirement		
Local Plan Submitted to the State by: Linda Connor Fred Gifford, MAXIM Technologies, Inc.	Title: Fort Peck Tribes DES Coordinator Senior Consultant	Date: January 14, 2004 September 2003

State Requirement		
State Reviewer: Larry Akers	Title: SHMO	Date: January 21, 2004

FEMA Requirement		
FEMA Reviewer: Wade Nofziger Mike Hillenburg Marty Kientz	Title: Hazard Mitigation Specialist Engineer Hazard Mitigation Specialist	Date: February 4, 2004 March 4, 2004 February 5, 2004
Date Received in FEMA Region VIII	January 27, 2004	
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approved	XXX	
Date Approved		

Point of Contact: Linda Connor	Local Plan Reviewed by:	
Title: DES Coordinator	Title:	
Agency: Fort Peck Tribes	NFIP Status (Single Jurisdiction)	
Phone Number: 406-768-5155	Participating <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>

Multi-jurisdiction: <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO (If yes, list each jurisdiction below:)	N/A*	NFIP Status (for mapped communities)	
1.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
2.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
3.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
4.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
5.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
6.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
7.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
8.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
9.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participating <input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Participating <input type="checkbox"/>
[ATTACH PAGE (S) WITH ADDITIONAL JURISDICTIONS]			

Local Plan POC: Please complete the information requested on this profile form. The form will be submitted with your plan to the State. Using the attached crosswalk, compare your local plan content with the criteria outlined. Please note under the column heading "Location in the Plan" the page(s) where your plan addresses/meets the criteria. Thank you.
--

* Not applicable for communities not mapped and/or who do not have an identified flood risk.

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW – FORT PECK TRIBES, MONTANA REGION VIII, MARCH 5, 2004 – PAGE 3

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN SUMMARY WORKSHEET

The plan cannot be reviewed if the prerequisite is not met for a single jurisdictional plan, or prerequisites are not met for a multi-jurisdictional plan.

All mandatory criteria, except those highlighted in gray, must receive a score of “**Satisfactory**” or “**Outstanding**” for the plan to receive FEMA approval. A less than “Satisfactory” score on subsections highlighted in gray will not preclude the plan from passing. Reviewer’s comments must be provided for requirements receiving a “**Needs Improvement**” score.

SCORING SYSTEM

Please check one of the following for each requirement.

U – Unsatisfactory: The plan does not address the criteria.

N – Needs Improvement: The plan addresses the criteria, but needs significant improvement. Reviewer’s comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum criteria. Reviewer’s comments are encouraged, but not required.

O – Outstanding: The plan exceeds the minimum criteria. Reviewer’s comments are encouraged, but not required.

Prerequisite (s) (Check Applicable Box)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body:
§201.6(c)(5) **OR**

Multi-jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5)
AND

Multi-jurisdictional Participation: §201.6(a)(3)

NOT MET	MET
	X
	-
	-

Planning Process

Documentation of the Planning Process:
§201.6(c)(1)

U	N	S	O
		X	

Risk Assessment

Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

Profiling Hazard Events: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Assets:
§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential
Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development
Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)

Multi-jurisdictional Risk Assessment:
§201.6(c)(2)(iii)

U	N	S	O
		X	
		X	
		X	
		X	
		X	
		-	

Mitigation Strategy

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Measures:
§201.6(c)(3)(ii)

Implementation of Mitigation Measures:
§201.6(c)(3)(iii)

Multi-jurisdictional Mitigation Strategy:
§201.6(c)(3)(iv)

U	N	S	O
		X	
		X	
		X	
		X	

Plan Maintenance Procedures

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan:
§201.6(c)(4)(i)

Implementation Through Existing Programs:
§201.6(c)(4)(ii)

Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)

U	N	S	O
		X	
		X	
		X	

Additional State Requirements*

Insert State Requirement

Insert State Requirement

Insert State Requirement

U	N	S	O
		-	
		-	
		-	

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED

PLAN APPROVED

XXX

*States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Plan Review Criteria* or create a new section. States need then modify this worksheet to record the score for those requirements.

See Reviewer’s Comments

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - FORT PECK TRIBES, MONTANA
REGION VIII, MARCH 5, 2004 - PAGE 4

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	S--SATISFACTORY O--OUTSTANDING
PREREQUISITE (S) (3-1)			<i>NOTE: The prerequisite, or prerequisites in the case of multi-jurisdictional plans, must be met before the plan can be approved.</i>	
Adoption by the Local Governing Body (3-2)	Requirement §201.6(c)(5): [The local hazard mitigation plan shall include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council)...	Appendix A	S	Adoption documentation complete.
OR				
Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption (3-3)	Requirement §201.6(c)(5): For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan must document that it has been formally adopted.		N/A	
AND				
Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation (3-4)	Requirement §201.6(a)(3): Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process... Statewide plans will not be		N/A	

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - FORT PECK TRIBES, MONTANA
REGION VIII, MARCH 5, 2004 - PAGE 5

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
	accepted as multi-jurisdictional plans.		
PLANNING PROCESS (3-5)			
Documentation of the Planning Process (3-6)	Requirement §201.6(c)(1): [The plan must document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.	Section 2.0, Pages 8-9, and Appendix D	S Planning process well documented. They did a good job of being inclusive.
RISK ASSESSMENT (3-9)			
Identifying Hazards (3-10)	Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the type...of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction...	Sections 3.1, 3.2 Pages 10-28	S Hazard identification was based on historical events. The research was thorough and complete.
Profiling Hazard Events (3-14)	Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the...location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan shall	Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4 Pages 10-28 and 31,33,35, and 39	S The events were well documented. Many were at specific locations and most contained clear damages. The applicant does a good job of determining the probability of future events.

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING	
	include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.			
Assessing Vulnerability: Overview (Currently found under Identifying Assets section, p.3-18—to be corrected in next version of the <i>Plan Criteria</i>)	Requirement 201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment shall include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description shall include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.	Section 3.3 and 3.4 Pages 28-39	S The plan does a great job of pulling together data. The plan states where the gaps are in the data and clearly outlines a method to estimate vulnerabilities. The method is also discussed and the plan outlines what works well and what the limitation are of the method used. For future revisions of the plan, earthquake hazard should be further developed. Although it was discussed in the hazard section, it was not clearly developed in the vulnerability section. This could have been that the potential occurs and losses were limited, but if this is the case, it should be documented in the plan.	
Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Assets (3-18)	Requirement 201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of: The types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas...	Section 3.3 Pages 28-30	S <i>Note: A less than "Satisfactory" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing</i> Good start for identifying critical facilities; used maps and narrative within the plan. Suggest refining those for the next update.	

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses (3-22)	Requirement 201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B): [The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate...	Section 3.5 Pages 39-40	S <i>Note: A less than "Satisfactory" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i> Good general view that can guide priorities. The plan uses a GIS method to graphically lay out vulnerabilities to buildings and critical facilities.
Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends (3-24)	Requirement 201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C): [The plan should describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.	Section 3.3.3 Page 30	<i>Note: A less than "Satisfactory" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</i> The plan speaks to the current development in the community and addresses future development.
Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment (3-26)	Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii): For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment section must assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.		N/A

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
MITIGATION STRATEGY (3-29)			<i>Note: Any changes made in the risk assessment to address previous unsatisfactory or needs improvement scores, will need to be reflected in the Mitigation Strategy section to gain final approval of the plan.</i>
Local Hazard Mitigation Goals (3-30)	Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): [The hazard mitigation strategy shall include: a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.	Section 4.1 Page 41	S They have identified an extensive range of mitigation goals that are coordinated with their Growth Plan. It also clearly ties back to the risk assessment.
Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Measures (3-34)	Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): [The mitigation strategy shall include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.	Sections 4.1,4.2, and 4.3 Pages 41-44	S They did a very nice job of laying out the things they want to do. Many are Preparedness and Response issues; however, there are several very good potential mitigation measures identified. The matrix and annex for those items are nicely done.
Implementation of Mitigation Measures (3-36)	Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii): [The mitigation strategy section shall include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local	Sections 4.3 and 4.4 Pages 42-44	S The mitigation strategy was clear and prioritized, using a cost vs. benefits method.

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
	jurisdiction. Prioritization shall include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.		
Multi-jurisdictional Mitigation Strategy (3-40)	Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): For multi-jurisdictional plans, there must be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.		N/A
PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCEDURES (3-43)			
Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan (3-44)	Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): [The plan maintenance process shall include a section describing the] method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.	Section 5.1 Page 46	S Plan is to be reviewed every two years as deemed necessary.

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW - FORT PECK TRIBES, MONTANA
REGION VIII, MARCH 5, 2004 - PAGE 10

PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA REFERENCE (SECTION PAGE #)	REQUIREMENT AS TAKEN FROM THE INTERIM FINAL RULE PART 201	LOCATION IN THE PLAN (INDICATE SECTION OR ANNEX AND PAGE #)	SCORE / STATE / FEMA REVIEWER COMMENTS <u>SCORING SYSTEM</u> MET/NOT MET (FOR PREREQUISITE (S) ONLY) U--UNSATISFACTORY S--SATISFACTORY N--NEEDS IMPROVEMENT O--OUTSTANDING
Implementation Through Existing Programs (3-48)	Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): [The plan shall include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate...	Section 5.2 Page 46	S Uses a Land Use Plan to address planning and zoning. The PDM plan and mitigation goals will be incorporated into the Tribal Land Use Plan. Very good.
Continued Public Involvement (3-50)	Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): [The plan maintenance process shall include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.	Section 5.3	S They appear to be serious about keeping the public informed about the planning process and want public involvement.
ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS			<i>States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the Plan Review Criteria or create a new section. States need then modify this worksheet to record the score for those requirements.</i>
	Insert State Requirement (s)		N/A